QI Maturity Tool (version 5)

Background:

This survey was created by the Multi-State Learning Collaborative evaluation team at the University of Southern Maine's Muskie School. The tool was designed to:

- Identify features of an organization that may be enhancing or impeding QI approaches
- Monitor the impact of efforts to create a more favorable environment for QI to flourish
- Define potential cohorts of public health agencies for evaluation purposes

Contact Information:

For more information on the QI Maturity Tool, including its development, reliability, validity, administration and scoring, please contact Brenda Joly at 207-228-8456 or bjoly@usm.maine.edu

Preferred Citation:

Joly BM, Booth M, Mittal P, Shaler G. (2012). Measuring Quality Improvement in Public Health: The Development and Psychometric Testing of a QI Maturity Tool. *Evaluation & the Health Professions*, 35(2) 119-147.

Or

Joly BM, Booth M, Mittal P, Zhang Y. (2013). Classifying Public Health Agencies Along a Quality Improvement Continuum. Frontiers in Public Health Services and Systems Research Vol. 2: No. 3, Article 2. Available at: http://uknowledge.uky.edu/frontiersinphssr/vol2/iss3/2

QI Maturity Tool

Directions: Please complete the following items by checking the most appropriate box.

		Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
		5	4	3	2	ı
1.	Leaders (e.g. board, senior management team) of my public health agency are receptive to new ideas for improving agency programs, services, and outcomes.					
2.	The impetus for improving quality in my public health agency is largely driven by an <i>internal</i> desire to make our services and outcomes better.					
3.	The board and/or the management team of my public health agency work together for common goals.				0	
4.	Staff consult with, and help, one another to solve problems.	0				0
5.	Staff members are routinely asked to contribute to decisions at my public health agency.	0				
6.	The <i>leaders</i> of my public health agency are trained in basic methods for evaluating and improving quality, such as Plan-Do-Study-Act.					
7.	Staff at my public health agency who provide public health services are trained in basic methods for evaluating and improving quality, such as Plan-Do-Study-Act.					

		Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree I
8. Many individuals responsible for services in my public health ag needed to assess the quality or services.	ency have the skills					
My public health agency has of for determining the quality of services.	•		0		_	
 Many individuals responsible for services at my public health ag systematic methods (e.g., root understand the root causes of 	ency routinely use cause analysis) to					0
11. Many individuals responsible for services at my public health ag best or promising practices which interventions for improving quantum	ency routinely use nen selecting					0
 Programs and services are cor to see if they are working as in effective. 	•					
 My public health agency has de Improvement Officer. 	esignated a Quality					
14. The quality of many programs agency is routinely monitored.						
15. Job descriptions for many indifference of the for programs and services at magency include specific responses measuring and improving quality.	ny public health sibilities related to				0	0
 Good ideas for measuring and one program or service USUA other programs or services in agency. 	LLY are adopted by				0	_
 Staff members at all levels part improvement efforts. 	ticipate in quality					
18. My public health agency has a council, committee or team.	quality improvement					
19. My public health agency has a plan.	quality improvement					
20. Customer satisfaction informa used by many individuals responsed and services in my public health	onsible for programs		0		0	
21. Accurate and timely data are a program managers to evaluate services on an ongoing basis.						
22. Many individuals responsible for services in my agency have the change practices or influence processervices within their areas of responsible for the services within	authority to policy to improve					

	Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
	5	4	3	2	1
 When trying to facilitate change, staff has the authority to work within and across program boundaries. 					
24. Improving quality is well integrated into the way many individuals responsible for programs and services work in my public health agency.					
 Agency staff is aware of external quality improvement expertise to help measure and improve quality. 	0				_
Spending time and resources on quality improvement is worth the effort.					
27. The key decision makers in my agency believe quality improvement is very important.					
28. Using QI approaches will impact the health of my community.					
29. Public health agency staff and stakeholders will notice changes in programs and services as a result of our QI efforts.	_				_

Thank you for participating.

Legend						
	Domain = Culture: values & norms that pervade how agency interacts with staff &					
	stakeholders					
	Domain = Capacity & competency: skills, functions & approach used to assess &					
	improve quality					
	Domain = Alignment & spread: QI supports & supported by organization & is diffused					
	within agency					

	Score
≤99	Beginning: Have not yet adopted formal QI projects, applied QI methods in a systematic
2//	way, or engaged in efforts to build a culture of QI.
100-106	Emerging: Newly adopted QI approaches, with limited capacity. Limited QI culture and
100-100	few, if any, examples of attempts to incorporate QI as a routine part of practice.
	Progressing: Some QI experience and capacity but often lack commitment, have minimal
107-120	opportunities for QI integration throughout the agency and are less sophisticated in their
	application and approach.
121-139	Achieving: Fairly high levels of QI practice, a commitment to QI, and an eagerness to
121-137	engage in the type of transformational change described by QI experts.
≥140	Excelling: High levels of QI sophistication and a pervasive culture of QI.

Retrieved from NACCHO.org 4/28/2015. Edits to question 2 internal/external forces made, scoring and legend added in order to align with: Joly BM, Booth M, Mittal P, Zhang Y. (2013). Classifying Public Health Agencies Along a Quality Improvement Continuum. Frontiers in Public Health Services and Systems Research Vol. 2: No. 3, Article 2. Available at: http://uknowledge.uky.edu/frontiersinphssr/vol2/iss3/2.